

ship will have an opportunity of perusing a paper addressed to me by the commissioners of Maine, which strongly presents the subject on other grounds and in other lights.

I am now to consider your Lordship's note of the 21st June. Before entering upon this, I have the President's instructions to say, that he fully appreciates the motives which induced your Lordship, personally to undertake your present mission; that he is quite aware that your public life has been distinguished by efforts to maintain peace and harmony between the two countries; that he quite well recollects that your exertions were employed to prevent the late war, and that he doubts not the sincerity of your declaration that nothing could have drawn you from your retirement and induced you to engage in your present undertaking, but the hope of being of service to your country and to our common race. And I have had the utmost pleasure, my Lord, in acknowledging the frankness, candor, and plain dealing, which have characterized your official intercourse with this Government, nor am I permitted or inclined to entertain any doubt of your Lordship's entire conviction, as expressed by yourself, as to the merits of the controversy and the difficulties of the case. The question before us is, whether these confident opinions, on both sides, of the rightful nature and just strength of our respective claims, will permit us, while a desire to preserve harmony and a disposition to yield liberally to mutual convenience so strongly influence us, to come together and unite on a line by agreement.

It appears to be your Lordship's opinion that the line of the St. Johns, from the point where the north line from the St. Croix strikes that river, up to some one of its sources, evidently suits both parties, with an exception, however, of that part of the Madawaska settlement which is on the south side of the St. Johns, which you propose should be included within the British territory. That on a line by agreement the St. Johns, for some distance upwards from its intersection by the line running north from the St. Croix, would be a very convenient boundary for the two parties is readily admitted; but it is a very important question how far up, and to which of the sources of this river this line should extend. Above Madawaska, the course of this river turns to the south, and stretches away towards the sources of the Penobscot, leaving far to the north the line of communication between New Brunswick and Canada. The line departs from the St. Johns altogether near Madawaska, and keeping principally upon the left or north bank of the Madawaska, and proceeding by the way of the Teniscounta lake, reaches the St. Lawrence at the mouth of the river Du Loup.

There are, then, two important subjects for consideration.

First, Whether the United States can agree to cede, relinquish, or cease to claim, any part of the territory west of the north line from the St. Croix and south of the St. John's. I think it but candid to say, at once, that we see insurmountable objections to admitting the line to come south of the river. Your Lordship's observations upon the propriety of preserving the unity of the Madawaska settlements, are, in a great measure, just, and altogether founded. I doubt not, in good motives. They savour of humanity and a kind regard to the interests and feelings of individuals. But the difficulties seem insuperable.

The river, as your Lordship remarks, seems a natural boundary, and in this part of it, to run in a convenient direction. It is a line always clear and indisputable. If we depart from it, where shall we find another boundary equally natural, equally clear, and conforming to the same general course? A departure from the line of river, moreover, would open new questions about equivalents, which it would probably be found impracticable to settle. If your Lordship was at liberty, as I understand you not to be, to cede the whole or a part of the territory, commonly called the strip, lying East of the North line, and West of the St. Johns, considerations might be found in such a cession, possibly, for some new demarcation West of the North line and South of the river. But in the present position of things I cannot hold out the expectation to your Lordship that any thing South of the river can be yielded.

And, perhaps, the inconvenience to the settlers on the southern bank, of making the river the boundary, are less considerable than your Lordship supposes. These settlers are scattered along a considerable extent, very likely soon to connect themselves with whomsoever may come to live near them; and though of different origin, and some difference of religion, not likely on the whole to be greatly dissimilar from the other borderers occupying the neighboring territory; their right of property would, of course, be all preserved, both of inheritance and alienation; and if some of them should choose to retain the political and social relations under which they now are, their removal for that purpose, to the north bank, drawing after it no loss of property or means of subsistence, would not be a great hardship.

Your Lordship suggests the inconvenience of dividing a municipality by a line of national boundary; and certainly there is force in the observation; but if, departing from the river, we were to establish at the south of it, an artificial line upon the land, there might be points upon such line, at which people would live in numbers, on both sides; and a mere mathematical line might thus divide villages, while it divided nations. The experience of the world, and our own experience, show the propriety of making the rivers boundaries, for the same reason that, in other cases to which they are applicable, mountain ranges, or ridges of highlands, are adopted for the same purposes; these last being, perhaps, still more equally clear and prominent objects, and the population of neighboring countries bordering on a mountain line of separation, being usually thin and inconsiderable on either side.

Rivers and inland waters constitute the boundary between the United States and the territory of Her Majesty for some thousands of miles westward from the place where the 45th degree of north latitude intersects the St. Lawrence; and along this line occasional irregularities and out-breaks have taken place, always by the agency and instigation of agitators and lawless men, friends of neither country; yet it is clear that no better demarcation of limit could be made. And at the north part, along the space through which

the St. Croix constitutes the line of separation, controversies and conflicts are not heard of; but similarity of language, character and pursuits, and mutual respect for the right of each other, preserve the general peace.

Upon the whole, my Lord, feeling that there may be inconvenience, and perhaps a small degree of hardship, I yet cannot admit there is any cruelty in separating the Madawaska settlers south of the St. John's, so far as political relations are concerned, from their neighbors on the north of that river.

In the present state of society and of peace, which exists between the two countries, the severance of political relations needs not to disturb social and family intercourse; while high considerations, affecting both the present and the future, seem to me to require, that, following natural indications, we adhere to the St. John's in this part of its course, at the line of division.

The next question is how far upward the boundary ought to be observed, and along which of its branches. This question would be easily settled if what may be called the main branch of the river, in this part of it, differing from the general character of the rivers in this region of the country, did not make a sudden turn. But, if we consider the main branch of the St. Johns, that which has been usually so denominated, your Lordship observes that, near the mouth of the Madawaska, it turns almost at right angles, and pushes its source towards those of the Penobscot. Contiguity and compactness of territory can hardly be preserved by following a stream which makes, not occasional windings, but at once so great a deflection from its previous course. The Madawaska is one of its branches or principal sources, and, as the map shows, is very much a continuation of the line of the principal river to the Great Falls upward. The natural course would therefore seem to be to continue along this branch.

We understand, and indeed collect from your Lordship's note, that with whatever opinion of her rights to the disputed territory, England, in asserting it, has principally in view to maintain on her own soil, her accustomed line of communication between Canada and New Brunswick. We acknowledge the general justice and propriety of this object, and agree at once, that, with suitable equivalents, a conventional line ought to be such as to secure it to England. The question, therefore, simply is, what line will secure it?

The common communication between the provinces follows the course of the St. John's from the Great Falls to the mouth of the Madawaska, going along with it to the streams running into the St. Lawrence. And this line of the communication we are willing to agree shall hereafter be within acknowledged British territory, upon such conditions and considerations as may be assented to. The Madawaska and the forementioned lakes might conveniently constitute the boundary, but I believe it is true that, in some parts of the distance, above the mouth of the Madawaska, it has been found convenient to establish the course of communication of the South bank of that river. This consideration may be important enough to justify a departure from what would otherwise be desirable, and the running of the line at some distance South of the Madawaska, observing natural monuments where it may be practicable, and thus leaving the whole valley of the Madawaska on the British side.

The United States, therefore, upon the adjustment of proper equivalents, would not object to a line of boundary which should begin at the middle of the main channel of the river St. John's, where the river is intersected by a due north line, extended from the source of the St. Croix, thence proceeding westerly of the Madawaska, thence by a straight line to the outlet of Long Lake, thence westerly by a direct line to the point where the river St. Francis empties into the lake called Pohenaymook, thence continuing in the same direct line to the highlands which divide the waters falling in the St. Francis. Having thus arrived at the highlands, I shall be ready to confer on the correct manner of following them to the northwesternmost head of Connecticut river.

Such a line as has been now described would secure to England a free intercourse between Canada and New Brunswick; and with the navigation of the St. John's yielded to the U. States, would appear to meet the wants of all parties. Your Lordship's proposition in regard to the navigation is viewed as just, and as constituting, as far as it may go, a natural equivalent. Probably the use of the river for the transportation of the products of the forest grown on the line, would be equally advantageous to both parties, and, therefore, in granting it, no sacrifice of British interest would be incurred. A conviction of this, together with their confidence in the validity of their own claims, is very likely to lead the two States immediately concerned, to consider their relinquishment of the lands north of the line much in the light of a mere cession. It need not be denied that, to secure this privilege, and to have a right to enjoy it, free from tax, or other liability or inability, is an object of considerable importance to the people of Maine.

Your Lordship intimates that, as a part of the general arrangement of boundaries, Eng. would be willing to surrender to the U. S., Rouse's Point and all the territory heretofore supposed to be within the boundaries of New Hampshire, Vermont and N. York, but what a correct ascertainment of the forty sixth parallel of North latitude, shows to be included within the British line. This concession is, no doubt, of some value. If made, its benefits would enure partly to these 3 States, and partly to the U. S.; and none of it to the particular interests of Maine and Massachusetts.

If regarded, therefore, as a part of the equivalent for the manner of adjusting the Northeastern boundary, these two last mentioned States would, perhaps, expect that the value, if it could be ascertained, should be paid to them. On this point further consideration may be necessary.

If in other respects we should be able to agree on a boundary, the points to which you refer, connected with the ascertainment of the head of the Connecticut, will be attended to, and Capt. Talcott, who made the exploration in that quarter, will be ready to communicate the result of his observations.

I have the honor to be, with distinguished consideration, your obedient servant.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Lord Ashburton, &c. &c.

From the Philadelphia Ledger. POLITICAL RANCOR.

No sentiment or feeling is more enduring than the rancor of a Tory. It can neither be worn out, washed out, or burnt out. It endures while life remains—unrelenting, unmitigated, unmitigable. A Tory believes himself superior to all but Tories; he claims exclusive privileges, and denies them to all but his own order;—and he despises all who have them not, and he hates all who would take them away. Hence contempt and hatred are the predominant governing sentiments of a Tory; and, under their influence, he necessarily becomes malignant, vituperative, cruel, reckless of reputation or life, regardless of the suffering which he inflicts upon those whom he despises and hates. English and American history furnishes abundant evidence of this character in Tories. In the wars between right and privilege, in the reign of Charles I, the cavaliers, or nobility, (of course Tories), acquired an infamous celebrity for the remorseless cruelty with which they trampled upon property, character, life, every other right, in the round-heads or republicans. In every subsequent struggle between privilege and right, the aristocracy of England have exhibited the same malignity, the same rancor, the same cruelty of temper, the same disregard to character and life, the same fiendish exultation in defaming, robbing, imprisoning, killing the advocates of human rights, which characterized their barbarous predecessors in the days of Charles I. During our revolutionary war, the cruelties inflicted by the British aristocracy upon the rebels were almost as atrocious as those which marked the desolating march of Jenghis Khan or Timur. At the commencement of the French revolution, when democratic principles began to spread in England, the aristocracy exhibited as much ferocity against such innovation as had ever characterized Tories in any Anglo-Saxon struggle between might and right. Hence the numerous trials for treason, the numerous findings, imprisonments, and transportation, which signalized the sanguinary and profligate reign of Charles III. We pronounce this reign profligate, because while the manners and habits of that monarch and his consort were correct enough, those of his children, and of the "upper classes" of his time were as thoroughly debased as those of the French court in the reign of Louis XV.

But the dark traits of character which are always exhibited by aristocrats, have not been confined, among the Anglo-Saxon breed, to the island of Britain; for the American Tories of our revolution exhibited all the malignant passions which characterized the British Government and its officers, and which were so signally displayed in Connecticut, and the Jersey prison-ship. In later times in our country, after the establishment of its independence, the spirit of aristocracy was awake, and exhibited the same unalloyed passions which ever attend all its movements. History has recorded the contests between parties which raged so fiercely during the presidency of John Adams. Of these parties, one denied the capacity of the people for self-government; insisted upon freehold suffrage, or such high pecuniary qualifications as placed the right of suffrage upon the close borough system; enacted the alien and sedition laws; required a standing army for the support of government, and insisted that liberty could never be safe in the United States, till their institutions were more assimilated to the monarchy of England. This party called themselves Federalists; though as they contended for a consolidated central Government, and greater limitation to the rights of the States, they had no just claim to this title. The other of these parties insisted that, in our country, mankind were enlightened and virtuous enough for self-government, and therefore could be trusted with universal suffrage; that, in a government founded on the popular will, standing armies were not merely useless, but dangerous; that alien and sedition laws were inconsistent with those principles for which the people contended in the Revolution; that as the federal principle was the only safe foundation of a republic in an extensive country, the rights of the States must be maintained; and consolidation, accumulation of power in Congress or the Executive should be resisted. They called themselves Democratic Republicans. In the controversies between these two parties, the Federalists generally, and especially in New England, and above all in Connecticut and Rhode Island, then under the government of royal charters, exhibited the same contemptuous and rancorous hatred which has always characterized the Tories of England, in their opposition to republicans, or any other advocates of liberal institutions.

In their opposition to Democratic Republicanism, the "Federalists" of those days, in their writing and speeches, prescribed no limits to libel, slander, vituperation. The English language, with all its fertility in terms of reproach, contained nothing too vile, in their estimation, for characterizing their opponents. They claimed "all the talent, all the learning, all the morality, all the decency" in the land, and they represented every Republican as steeped in vice of all kinds—as sunk to the lowest point of intellectual and moral degradation—as unfit for any thing but fining, imprisoning, whipping, crupping, branding, starving, and hanging. Like the ferocious, brutal cavaliers, of Charles I, (who claimed to be the only "gentleman," and yet would not even think of a round-head without outraging every christian injunction,) these Federal writers, claiming all the "morality, all the decency," could never mention Democrats and Democracy without exhibiting passions and language from which christianity recoils in abhorrence, and essential good breeding turn in disgust.

Though the success of Democracy over aristocracy—of right over might—has restrained, in some degree, those fierce and brutal passions, and diffused manners of a milder tone, more consonant with christian principles,—yet such passions are not extinct; such manners will occasionally, and frequently too, exhibit their revolting features. Those who were nursed in this unwholesome school, still cling to their idols;—still vituperate and defame as bitterly, as remorselessly as ever. We find the proofs of the unmitigated rancor with which some old Federalists pursue the suffrage party in Rhode Island. But we have lately found an instance which

proves the malignity against the advocates of human rights, which raged during the contest between the Democratic and Federal parties by "Jenny Jones," the other day, at a gathering in Galena, has lost nothing of its intensity. One of the newspapers in a neighboring city, in a brief biographical sketch of Richard Ricker, formerly recorder of the city of New York, and lately deceased, says that he began his political career as a Federalist—as *was* *all* the respectable and honest men of that time. Here is a declaration, in terms, by a press conducted by an old Connecticut Federalist, that the Democratic party of this country, at the time of Mr. Ricker's entrance into the political theatre, about the end of Gen. Washington's Presidency, did not contain one honest or respectable man! We hardly believed that, at this late day, any partisan slanderer, however malignant or wicked, would be quite audacious enough for a declaration so shameless. At no time would the Democratic party of this country justify such description; at the time alluded to, it constituted nearly one half of the people, and quite, if not more than one half, of the intellectual and moral merit; it became soon afterwards a majority, and has been an overwhelming majority ever since. At this time, as did subsequently, this party contained such men as Jefferson, Madison, Pendleton, Dallas, George Clinton, Samuel Adams, John Lafayette, and the bright constellations of talent and moral worth which led the Democratic armies to victory, in the struggle for human rights, in every State in the Union. Among such spirits, and a majority of this nation, no *honest* or *respectable* man could be found? And who utters this audacious falsehood? This detestable slander upon the majority of his countrymen, and upon the brightest and best of those whom they have delighted to honor? A Tory of the Connecticut blue-light school. A pupil of that school which challenges the intemperate distinction of giving reasonable aid to the enemies of their country, during its second struggle for independence! This would be too much at any time. But at this late day it is a scurrilous profanation of the illustrious dead, which a virtuous public opinion should brand with the same marks that stain the memory of Benedict Arnold. Let every Democratic press in the Union speak out, and transmit to a loathing posterity the infamy of this audacious and reckless slanderer. Well may we say that it is impossible for a leopard to change his spots; for a Tory to mitigate his malignity against the advocates of equal rights.

ANOTHER DEVELOPMENT.

The Madisonian of Saturday says that a number of the Weekly Ohio State Journal has found its way to us by mistake—and an awkward mistake, it seems to us, to have been. The envelope was endorsed "Madisonian," but on the inside it was directed to a certain paper in the State of New York. Well, along the margin we find the following precious piece of intelligence, in pencil mark: "Be cautious how you let on Ohio. We are laying a great deal of pipe—7,000 Kentuckians—2,500 Hoosiers—700 Wolverines, and a thousand or too of all sorts of varment. This is a great country, and Tom Corwin is a great man. It won't do for us to be beat." The name of the New York paper we do not give—it may be seen in our sanctum.

LITERARY BEQUEST. We learn from the New Hampshire Patriot that a gentleman of Merrimack county, has made a bequest of \$30,000, to be applied, after his decease, in the following manner:—

"Of the interest arising from the fund, \$500 is to be given annually to the person who shall compose the best essay advocating the total abolition of paper money, and the adoption of a pure metallic currency; and \$500 is to be given annually to the person who shall compose the best essay advocating free trade and direct taxation, the total abolition of all impost duties and tariff laws, and the support of government by direct taxes, laid mainly on property. Upon the demise of the wife of the deviser, the estate bequeathed to her will go into this fund, and so will the respective portions of his two children, in case either or both die before reaching twenty one years of age. This accession to the fund would increase it to about \$50,000. It is then provided that the whole amount of the bequest shall be given to the school fund of that state of the Union (which shall first permanently abolish and exclude paper money, and adopt a pure metallic currency.)"

Longevity. A most remarkable case of longevity, in cold rigid New England, is that of John Gilley, of Augusta, Me., who died a few days since, at the venerable age of 124. He married at the age of 80, a girl of 18 years old, by whom he had ten children, the youngest of whom, at his death, was more than 100 years younger than his father. He was of Irish origin, but a native born citizen of Maine. His hair was a pure silver white, a small lock of which was exhibited to us, a day or two since, by a gentleman who had it from his physician. A short time before his death it turned black. His teeth were perfect and sound to within a short period of his death. So remarkable a man was he in his day, that he was a subject of curiosity to all who visited that section of the country where he resided. The late Dr. Harris was of that number. The late Gov. Gore of this commonwealth, while on a tour to Maine, paid him a visit and gave him a dollar for every year of his life.

Boston Transcript.

Many a poor fellow whose reputation has unjustly suffered, can bear testimony to the truth of the following:—

"To acquiesce under a report, in silence, said Tristram Shandy, 'is to acknowledge it openly—as least in the opinion of one half of the world—and to make a bustle in contradicting it is to affirm it as strongly in the opinion of the other half.'"

Use of a Log Cabin. The N. York Commercial says a herd of buffaloes from the West arrived in that city last Saturday, and were lodged at the Log Cabin in Broadway. Better have buffaloes than Ohio Bares there.

Native Proquence.—"Feller citizens," said a warm admirer of "Old Teennsch," and "Brother Jones," the other day, at a gathering in Galena, Kentucky, "Feller citizens, whar the newspapers in a neighboring city, in a brief biographical sketch of Richard Ricker, formerly recorder of the city of New York, and lately deceased, says that he began his political career as a Federalist—as *was* *all* the respectable and honest men of that time. Here is a declaration, in terms, by a press conducted by an old Connecticut Federalist, that the Democratic party of this country, at the time of Mr. Ricker's entrance into the political theatre, about the end of Gen. Washington's Presidency, did not contain one honest or respectable man! We hardly believed that, at this late day, any partisan slanderer, however malignant or wicked, would be quite audacious enough for a declaration so shameless. At no time would the Democratic party of this country justify such description; at the time alluded to, it constituted nearly one half of the people, and quite, if not more than one half, of the intellectual and moral merit; it became soon afterwards a majority, and has been an overwhelming majority ever since. At this time, as did subsequently, this party contained such men as Jefferson, Madison, Pendleton, Dallas, George Clinton, Samuel Adams, John Lafayette, and the bright constellations of talent and moral worth which led the Democratic armies to victory, in the struggle for human rights, in every State in the Union. Among such spirits, and a majority of this nation, no *honest* or *respectable* man could be found? And who utters this audacious falsehood? This detestable slander upon the majority of his countrymen, and upon the brightest and best of those whom they have delighted to honor? A Tory of the Connecticut blue-light school. A pupil of that school which challenges the intemperate distinction of giving reasonable aid to the enemies of their country, during its second struggle for independence! This would be too much at any time. But at this late day it is a scurrilous profanation of the illustrious dead, which a virtuous public opinion should brand with the same marks that stain the memory of Benedict Arnold. Let every Democratic press in the Union speak out, and transmit to a loathing posterity the infamy of this audacious and reckless slanderer. Well may we say that it is impossible for a leopard to change his spots; for a Tory to mitigate his malignity against the advocates of equal rights."

OXFORD DEMOCRAT.

PARIS, OCTOBER 18, 1842.

"To what a pitiable condition has our poor country become reduced! The administration of its affairs was conducted with decency and even dignity by Jackson and Van Buren, compared with the present disgraceful career of John Tyler and company."—N. Haven Palladium.

The above honest confession we cut from one of the most thorough-going whig journals in the country. It is just as we anticipated. As the whigs come to their senses they will admit that the administration of Jackson, which they characterized as tyrannical and ruinous to the country, was "conducted with decency and even dignity, compared with the present disgraceful administration which they brought into power." But why do they attribute all the disgrace which their administration has brought upon the country to Tyler? Have they not succeeded in carrying every measure under Tyler, save one, which they anticipated before "Old Tip's" death. Have they not repealed the Sub-Treasury? passed the Bankrupt Law? Distributed the proceeds of our Public Domain among the States? Given a protective Tariff to the Manufacturer, and had every opportunity, with the professed aid of the Democratic party, to reform abuses and retrench the expenditures of the Government. And what has been the effect of their measures, thus far, upon the country? Has it not cost the people EIGHT OR TEN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS MORE a year for whigs to administer the Government, than for Democrats? Have not the lengths of the Sessions of Congress nearly doubled? Does the husbandman get his promised reward for his labour by any increase of prices upon his produce or his stock? Does wool bear a higher price by the operation of the new Tariff law, which admits nine-tenths of all the wool imported into the country free of duty, than it did three or four years since under the "ruinous policy of free-trade?" In fact, the whigs have had every thing their own way for the last two years, and the more honest ones are now constrained to admit that the Administrations of Jackson and Van Buren were conducted with decency and dignity, while the one of their own creating must end in ruin in disgracing themselves and the country.

From the Portland American.

MARYLAND REDEMPTION! The Coons roved up Salt River!

The Baltimore papers of Sunday give the final result of the election in Maryland, by which it will be seen that there is an joint ballot A DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY OF SIX! In St. Mary there is a tie between the highest democratic candidate and the lowest coon. This result is the more gratifying as it secures us a Democratic Senator to Congress, in place of Mr. Kerr, whose term expires on the 4th of March next.

Last year the federal coons had a majority on joint ballot of four, giving a Democratic net gain from last year of TEN MEMBERS.

GREAT FIRE IN PORTLAND.

This city, says the Portland American, was visited on Wednesday night last by the most destructive fire it has experienced since that in Green Street some sixteen or seventeen years since. The fire commenced in a Cabinet Ware House of Mr. Geo. Clark on Congress St. formerly Main Street, which was wholly consumed. Among the great number of buildings destroyed were ten dwelling houses. Loss estimated at \$30,000.

REVOLUTIONARY RELICS. Col. Beckman, of Long Island, has left with the Editor of the N. Y. Herald, the identical papers and Documents which were found in the boat of Major Andre, the British Spy, at the time of his capture. It will be remembered that the discovery of these papers exposed the treason of Arnold and saved the American army at West Point, and perhaps the liberties of the country.

The report, which appeared in the Boston papers a week or two since, that F. O. J. Smith had received the appointment of Postmaster at Portland, is not yet confirmed. We hope for the honor of the country that this political Judas will not receive his thirty pieces of silver to reward him for his perfidy to the Democratic party.

The "coon" party express much dissatisfaction at the "clambakes" now fashionable in the neighborhood of the King's Chartered "Plantation." Not only have they disappointed the people in their expectation of roast beef, but they envy them the luxury of a few clams. Great friends of the people these "coons."

Disgraceful. The Coos County Democrat states, that the Statesman, a whig paper published in New Hampshire, in a brief notice of the death of President Tyler's late wife, makes the following sneering remarks:—

"We could not, with more sincere regret, have announced the fact, had God, in his Providence, have seen fit to have sent his messenger a little nearer the President's bosom."

Gen. Cass. The last Boston Post, contains an extract from a letter to the editor dated Paris, Sept. 17. It states the following:—

"The settlement of our difficulties with France has taken from the government the motives which induced the President to advise Gen. Cass to remain in France, and he gladly embraces the occasion to return to his country and his friends. He will leave Paris for America, by the way of Liverpool and Boston, as soon as he can get formal permission."

For a day
The lapse of
ing festival, fine
and abundant
and in the con
ness. The m
moyed. Religio
influences over
industrious, an
ing in all the cl
Thus signally
ple we should u
heartfelt gratit
In view there
in accordance w
tom I have appr
tive Council, H
Novembers, and
GIVING AND
The people of
abstain from vi
on that day
places of public
cises suited to
And while the
enjoyment of ci
ing of republics
of our obligatio
ciples upon wh
bounties of a ki
who are less fav
to the suffering
humanity.
Gives at the
eighty day
cen hundred
year of the
Dr. the Govern
PHILIP C.
Delaware. A
5th inst. for
country in the
the whigs sweep
The largest c
that raised by
weighs 4160 lb
The Rhode I
voluntarily tend
Anthony and P
charity govern
FEDER
There it is la
to build a "Jo
fond of" coons"
especial benefi
Alack! Poor
M A S
RIODE ISLAND
NOVA S
In Housat
evil Hall, Mr.
admission in r
or rather of w
floated into po
"They (the
upon what cour
men from the ci
rights man and
and the equally
er in a spirit of
With such a
and ends of al
ciples, but eas
agreed upon w
who can wond
of the ship of
reling about th
A bearer of
ved at Washin
Santa Anna re
Vadly Thom
any thing he
menace—that
the United Sta
Not so bad—
his patrons for
and challenged
not he would v
plied that he w
gio man in his
his own money
to a close snip
about the fight
The Madiso
Tyler is "ever
ville Journal r
tain is only tw
Gougou's Da
two years ther
branches, and
dred millions
John Smith
the rest, that a
ry man ought
S. D. Lay
stors and pro
died at his
since, in the
fire of Irelan

